

Attorney's Docket No.: 12361-014002

In the Claims:

Please further amend the previously-amended Claims 58, 66, 75, and 79 as follows:

Sub D1
C4 58. (Newly Amended) The method as in claim 57, wherein lengths of two ~~different~~ adjacent birefringent segments are different by a factor of 2^{2^n} , where ~~n is a positive integer factor.~~

Sub D1
C5 66. (Twice Amended) The device as in claim 65, wherein lengths of two ~~different~~ adjacent birefringent segments are different by a factor of $2^{M \cdot n}$, where ~~M and n are positive integers representing higher and lower order numbers of said two different birefringent segments, respectively, with $1 \leq n \leq (M-1)$, and $M \geq 2$.~~

Sub D1
C6 75. (Twice Amended) The method as in claim 72, wherein lengths of two ~~different~~ adjacent birefringent segments are different by a factor of $2^{M \cdot n}$, where ~~M and n are positive integers representing higher and lower order numbers of said two different birefringent segments, respectively, with $1 \leq n \leq (M-1)$, and $M \geq 2$.~~

Attorney's Docket No.: 12361-014002

79. (Twice Amended) The method as in claim 78, wherein lengths of two different adjacent birefringent segments are different by a factor of 2^{M-n} , where ~~M and n are positive integers representing higher and lower order numbers of said two different birefringent segments, respectively, with $1 \leq n \leq (M-1)$, and $M \geq 2$.~~